REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 14-25, 27-29, 31 and 33-51 were pending and presented for examination in this application. In an Office Action dated November 26, 2007, claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 14-25, 27-29, 31 and 33-51 were rejected.

No claims are amended or cancelled herein.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

In the 3rd paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 14-25, 27-29, 31 and 33-51 under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gross et al., US Pub. 2004/0143569 A1 in view of Grewal et al., US Pub. 2003/0084032 A1. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim1 recites in part:

generating and storing in a memory of the client device a local index of a plurality of articles associated with at least one of a user or the client device and stored on the client device, each article having an article type from a plurality of article types, wherein each article type indicates a computer readable data format for an article;

executing on the client device a search query on the local index to produce a first result set of articles relevant to the search query, the first result set referencing a plurality of articles having different article types;

receiving on the client device from a remote search system a second result set from a search of a global index, the second result set relevant to the search query;

receiving, from the user, a selection of user-defined display parameters, including a selection of article types to be displayed at the client device;

generating on the client device a user interface based on the selection of article types to be displayed, wherein the user-interface includes a plurality of spatially segregated sections of a display of the client device wherein each of the segregated sections is associated with one of the selected article types; and

displaying the first and second result sets to the user in the generated user interface of the client device, wherein the plurality of articles in the first result sets are displayed in the plurality of segregated sections according to their article types.

Claims 18 and 24 recite similar elements. Claim 24 recites a computer-readable medium upon which is encoded program code for performing the method of Claim 1. Claim 18 recites claim elements directed to "generating on the client device a user interface based on the selection of article types to be displayed, the user interface including a combined display of the first result set and the second result set, wherein the user-interface includes a plurality of spatially segregated sections of a display of the client device wherein each of the segregated sections is associated with one of the selected article types" and "displaying the combined display of the result sets in the generated user interface, wherein the first and second result sets are segregated in the user interface and the plurality of articles in the first result set are displayed in the plurality of segregated sections according to their article types".

These elements allow the user to define a user interface of the client device for controlling the display of local ("first result set") and global search results ("second result set") through the "selection of user-defined display parameters" including "the selection of article types to be displayed," wherein "each article type indicates a computer readable data format for an article." A user interface is generated on the client device, where the user interface includes "a plurality of spatially segregated sections of a display of the client device, wherein each of the segregated sections is associated with one of the selected article types." Search results for global and local searches are segregated in the generated user interface with the local search results being displayed in the plurality of segregated sections according to their article types. In effect, the user interface filters the result set from a local search of the client device based on the user selection of article types to be displayed.

FIG. 3 of the specification is one example embodiment that operated in accordance with the claimed method. FIG. 3 illustrates a user defined graphic user interface 301 that

includes spatially segregated sections which reference article types of Files 306, Email 304 and Chat messages 308 based on the user selection of article types to be displayed in a set of user-defined display parameters. Search results from a global search of the Web 302 and a local search are displayed in the graphic user interface. Local search results are displayed in the segregated sections for Files 306, Email 204 and Chat Messages 308 according to their article type. In FIG. 3 global and local results are generated using the search term 'flower' and displayed in segregated sections in the generated user interface 301. The segregated section showing local search results from Files 306 is on the left side of the user interface in FIG. 3 and the segregated section showing local search results from Emails 205 on the right side of the user interface.

Neither Gross nor Grewal disclose the claimed elements, alone or in combination. Gross is directed to a system for incremental searching as a user enters characters into search fields. Grewal is directed to a method of displaying search results based on user selection of a control (*see* FIG. 6, 100 of Grewal) which enables the user to broaden or narrow a set of search results.

Both Gross and Grewal fail to disclose "generating on the client device **a user interface based on user selection of article types to be displayed** wherein the user-interface includes **a plurality of spatially segregated sections** of the client device display wherein **each of the segregated sections is associated with one of the selected article types**."

Gross fails to disclose elements that govern the generation of a user-interface such as "user-defined display parameters, including article types to be displayed", where the article types define a generated "user interface based on the selection of article types to be

displayed." Gross does not appear to allow the user to select which article types to be displayed, thus defining a user interface based on selection of article types. In her response, the Examiner acknowledges "*Gross, however, does not explicitly disclose a user interface to display search results based on user selection of article types.*"

The Examiner asserts that Grewal discloses a user-interface to display search results based on a "**user selection**". However, the user-interface disclosed in Grewal is generated based on a user selection of **vectors** which allow the user to narrow search results based on information of interest to a specific community they belong to (*see* paragraphs [0022]-[0024] of Grewal). For example, Grewal in [0022] states "For example, a user can be an engineer in a power systems business and located in Florida. That specific user therefore could be a member of an engineering community (vector 1), an engineering community comprising engineers in power systems businesses (vector 2), as well as an engineering community comprising engineers in power systems businesses located in Florida (vector 3)." There is no question that these "community" vectors have nothing to do with any "article types". Thus thus Grewal does not disclose or suggest "a user selection of **article types to be displayed**" as claimed.

This analysis by the Examiner further ignores the claim limitation that the user interface "includes a plurality of spatially segregated sections of the client device display wherein each of the segregated sections reference one of the selected article types". As discussed above, neither Gross nor Grewal disclose selection of article types. Gross and Grewal consequently fail to disclose "a plurality of spatially segregated sections of the client device display wherein each of the segregated sections reference one of the selected article types."

Accordingly, Gross and Grewal fail to disclose "displaying the first and second result sets to the user in the generated user interface of the client device, wherein the plurality of articles in the first result sets are displayed in the plurality of segregated sections according to their article types". Similar to the above discussed claim element, the Examiner also ignores the claim limitation "wherein the plurality of articles in the first result sets are displayed in the plurality of segregated sections according to their article types" from the analysis.

Gross's failure to teach or disclose spatial segregation of search results according to result set is made apparent, for example, in FIGS. 3A-3H of Gross. FIG. 3B of Gross, for example, shows only a single list of search results on the left side of the screen at 308B; the currently selected result is shown in detail at 310B on the right side. Thus Gross does not show first and second results at the same time in a spatially segregated manner.

Grewal does not remedy the deficiencies of Gross. As discussed above, Grewal is directed to the display search results based on user selection of communities and is silent to the display of article types. Therefore, both Grewal and Gross fail to teach or disclose "the first result sets are displayed in the plurality of segregated sections according to their article types".

Based on the above amendments and remarks, claims 1, 18 and 24 are patentably distinguishable over Gross and Grewal. Claims 3-6, 8-10, 14-17, 19-23, 25, 27-29, 31 and 33-51 depend from claims 1, 18 and 24. Claims 3-6, 8-10, 14-17, 19-23, 25, 27-29, 31 and 33-51 also recite elements not disclosed by the cited art. Thus, claims 3-6, 8-10, 14-17, 19-23, 25, 27-29, 31 and 33-51 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art.

Summary

In sum, pending claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 14-25, 27-29, 31 and 33-51 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
David Marmaros, et al.

Date: February 26, 2008

By: /Robert R. Sachs/

Robert R. Sachs, Reg. No. 42,120
Attorney for Applicants
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (415) 875-2410
Fax: (415) 281-1350